



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,654	03/20/2006	Hiroyuki Tsukashima	127412	4516
25944	7590	08/27/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				TAMAI, KARL I
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2834				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/27/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/572,654	TSUKASHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KARL I.E. TAMAI	2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 8-12 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa et al. (US Publication 20020050752) in view of Takao (Japanese Publication No. 06-121496).

Katsuzawa et al. '052 discloses:

- A motor module (10, Figures 12 and 13) supplied with electric power from an external wiring (70) having a motor winding (7) and a terminal block (10) electrically connecting said motor winding to said external wiring.
- The terminal block (10) having an internal connector 81 with first contact below power terminal 84 mating perpendicular to the shaft with the internal conductor 81 via screw 82 and a second contact that mates with the stator winding leads 7 which have a deformation perpendicular to the shaft (figure 12) and a plate terminal 83 on the tip of the flexible lead 7 and connected to the internal connector 81 by a fixing screw 82.

Katsuzawa et al. '052 does not disclose:

- The motor winding being subjected to varnish treatment.
- The flexible member being higher in flexibility than the motor winding.

- The flexible member is made of a material that is less hardened by the varnish, capable of suppressing permeation of the varnish, and does not harden by the varnish.

Takao '496 discloses:

- The motor winding (3, Drawing 2) being subjected to varnish treatment (par. 20, lines 4-5). Takao teaches the motor winding 3 having terminal 10 is connected with a lead wire 4 both of which are subject to varnish treatment, and where the lead wire has a higher flexibility and less hardened because the varnish is not encapsulated in the varnish in the stator slots and because the varnish does not infiltrate/permeate the lead wire 4 at the cable connection (par. 8). The motor winding (3, Drawing 2) being stiffened and hardened (par. 20, lines 4-5). Takao teaches the varnish infiltrates or sinks (permeates) into the stator (par. 10) and is hardened to insulate and secure the coils in the stator.

The advantage of Takao '496 is to prevent excess varnish around the coils (abstract, lines 2-6; par. 21, lines 6-10) while impregnating the coils with varnish. Takao '496 teaches that it is known to provide a motor winding (3, Drawing 2) being subjected to varnish treatment (par. 20, lines 4-5) and also have the motor winding (3, Drawing 2) being stiffened and hardened (par. 20, lines 4-5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a motor winding of Katsuzawa (figures 12 and 13) with the stator, windings, and leads being subject to varnish to provide improved insulation to the coils and to allow the leads to remain flexible, as taught by Takao.

3. Claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuzawa et al. '052 in view of Takao '496 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sasamoto et al. (Sasamoto)(US 5132584). Katsuzawa and Takao teach every aspect of the invention except the flexible member being a braided wire or a plate like conductor. Sasamoto teaches the flexible braided wire 57 (col. 6, line 58), shown a plate like conductor with a deformable portion 57a (col. 6, line 37) to conducts electricity to the stator windings but reduces the transmissions of vibrations between the stator and the support. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to construct the machine of Katsuzawa and Takao with a braided or plate conductor to provide an electrical conductor with reduced vibration transmission, as taught by Sasamoto.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 8-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 06/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not in view of the new ground of rejection. Applicant's argument that the varnish must permeate the lead 4 is not persuasive because the limitation is not claimed, only that winding is hardened by being permeated with varnish.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl I.E. Tamai whose telephone number is (571) 272 - 2036.

The examiner can be normally contacted on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Darren Schuberg, can be reached at (571) 272 - 2044. The facsimile number for the Group is (571) 273 - 8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karl I Tamai/
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
August 27, 2008